

~~SECRET~~

3 October 1960

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: DD/P Reply to IG Inspection Report of NE Division,
TS 175989, dated 29 July 1960 (delayed in transmission).

1. On 27 September 1960, at the weekly Staff Meeting, Mr. Kirkpatrick agreed with the recommendation of the NE team that no reply be made to the referenced document. It was pointed out that this was the sort of answer which had been anticipated, and that the points at issue largely concerned the division management itself. Since the division chief has now resigned from the Agency it would serve no useful purpose to develop a written rebuttal to the stated position. On 30 September [REDACTED] and I met with [REDACTED] and told him that we would be happy to clarify any point which may not be clear to him, but that otherwise we planned no further action. [REDACTED] said that he had been Chief NE for only four days and that he had not yet read our entire report, but that he planned to do so. He carefully avoided committing himself to any issue raised in the report, but neither did he attempt to defend the division on any point. I believe that he has an open mind and that some changes will be made.

2. Since the date of the report I have talked to a number of the NE branch chiefs and other key individuals in the GS-15 and GS-14 levels. I understand that the DD/P position was prepared by [REDACTED], and that neither the IG report nor the DD/P reply was seen by anyone outside the front office of [REDACTED]. Sections of the report were extracted and sent to the working level unit concerned, with instructions to prepare comments to be incorporated into the division reply. In some instances the ultimate division reply was contrary to that proposed by the section or branch, but the working level was not advised of changes. One example is the section concerning the reports function. The non-concurrences of the division are in practically all cases an avoidance of the issue rather than an intelligent rebuttal. While no further action is contemplated by this office, the following comments are made for possible future reference.

a. The division, both in the referenced memorandum and in [REDACTED] earlier memorandum, objected to our appraisal of the organizational structure and insisted that branch chiefs always had access to the division chief. This is strictly the front office view, however, and the branch chiefs have continued to tell us since the inspection that they don't know what is going on at the next level.

b. In the section on the CA Staff we recommended that a "charter" be developed to provide the staff with some guidance on what it is supposed to do. In the rebuttal the division states, that "policies, procedures, and requirements for over-all NE objectives are well established and recognized". If this is so, no one could tell us what they were when we interviewed them. All of the staff chiefs (CA, FI, and CE) emphasized that their jobs were only what they could make them by persuading the operating branches that the staffs could make a contribution.

25X1C4b

d. With respect to Recommendation 6, the division states that the arrangement with cover organizations is not proper regulatory material. This information is already in the regulations, but in an inadequate form.

e. It is not necessary to comment on their reply to Recommendation 10, in which they state that it is neither feasible nor desirable to develop a long-range career development plan for employees.

25X1C4a

25X1A6a

25X1A9a

3. [REDACTED] will attach their comments with respect to areas which were their particular responsibility.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]